arXiv:cond-mat/9807171v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 11 Jul 1998

ON THE SIGN OF THE STATIC DIELECTRIC FUNCTION AT $T = 0$

Alejandro Cabo Montes de Oca[1]

Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics
Miramare, Trieste, Italy,

Instituto de Física, Universidad de Guanajuato
Lomas del Bosque # 103, Lomas del Campestre
37150 León, Guanajuato; México
and
Instituto de Cibernética Matemática y Física
Calle E, No. 309. Esq. a15, Vedado, La Habana, Cuba

Abstract.

The question of allowed signs of the static dilectric function for exactly homogeneous ground states in many body systems is further analyzed. The discussion is restricted to zero temperature situation. Firstly, it is argued that the positivity is equivalent to the requirement that the work needed to adiabatically connect an static charge density, be positive. In particular the rule seems to be a fully appropiate stability condition if the system interact with a freely moving but Coulomb interacting compensating jellium. This situation is common in thermodynamical equiliubrium discussions, in which the system can be stable or not in dependence of the relaxation of some external constraints. Further, an argument based in a quantized electromagnetic field treatment is also given. It requires $\epsilon > 0$ as an intrinsic stability condition for the charged system independently of the jellium dynamics. Possible implications for the more complex finite temperature situations are commented.

---

[1] Work supported by CONACyT under contract 3979PE-9608

1 Introduction.

The problem of the positivity of the static dielectric function have been debated in the literature in close connection with a related but not equivalent question about the validity of the dispersion relations [1-4]. In the works [3] and [4] it has been argued that negative values of $\epsilon(\vec{k})$ are allowed by stable translation invariant physical systems. The conclusion was extracted from a discussion of appropriate effective actions which should have minimum values at equilibrium.

In a previous work [5] we have considered the requirement for a positive work in adiabatically creating a fluctuation of the charge density in the background. The conclusion was that such a condition implies the positivity of $\epsilon(k)$. Then, in this work we intend to clarify the connections among the results of [3],[4] and our work [5]. Only the null temperature situation will be considered here. The harder physical problematic at $T \neq 0$ will be discussed elsewhere.

The work start in Section 1, from adapting the variational derivation of the positivity of the effective action, to the problem [6]. The considered physical system consists of several Coulomb interacting species of charged particles in interaction with a compensating jellium. Then, the adiabatic connection of the auxiliary electrostatic external source allow to obtain the same stability conditions of [3] and [4] from the positivity of the effective action. The variational discussion being used clarifies the meaning of the positivity for the work done in connecting the charge functuation [5]. It is simple equivalent to requiring that the energy $E[\rho]$ of the state after the adiabatic connection of the sources becomes greater than the ground state energy E_g. The inequality $\epsilon(\vec{k}) \geq 0$ directly follows from this requirement.

A first conclusion then follows. It refers to systems in which the jellium charge density is freely moving but Coulomb interacting with the particles, that is, systems in which the jellium homogeneity is assured self consistently by the Coulomb interaction. In such situation if $E[\rho]$ can be lower than the ground state energy E_g, the system can relax by itself to an inhomogeneous configuration by generating a jellium density modulation. Therefore, in order that the whole system: particles + jellium, be stable the positivity of $\epsilon(\vec{k})$ is needed.

Next, in Section 2, after considering the electromagnetic field as quantized, the positivity of $\epsilon(\vec{k})$ follows as an intrinsic stability requirement coming from the internal dynamics of the charged particle system and being independent of the jellium nature.

In the summary, the main conclusions are reviewed and comments on the posible implications for the finite temperature case are given.

2 $\epsilon(\vec{k}) > 0$ and positive work conditions

Let us consider a many body system consisting of r Coulomb interacting species of charges. Its quantization is described by the transition amplitude

$$\mathcal{Z}[\phi] = \frac{I[\phi]}{I[0]} =< \Omega_g, \mathrm{in}|\Omega_g, out >_\phi \tag{1}$$

where $|\Omega_g>$ is the ground state associated to the Hamiltonian in the absence of the external electrostatic field and it is assumed that the static field $\phi(\vec{x})$ is adiabatically connected from $|\Omega_g, in>$ at the begining, further maintained during a long interval T and after disconnected when the state becomes $|\Omega_g, out>$ [6].

The hamiltonian after introducing the field $\phi(\vec{x}, t)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H \;\; = \;\; & \int d^3x \sum_{s=1}^{r} \psi_s^+(\vec{x}) \hat{O}_s \psi_s(\vec{x}) - \int d^3x \Big(\sum_{s=1}^{r} q_s \psi_s^+(\vec{x}) \psi_s(\vec{x}) - \rho_0 \Big) \phi(\vec{x}) + \\ & \frac{1}{2} N \left[\int d^3x d^3y \sum_{s,t=1}^{r} q_s \psi_s^+(\vec{x}) \psi_s(\vec{x}) \frac{(2 - \delta_{st})}{\epsilon |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} q_t \psi_t^+(\vec{y}) \psi_t(\vec{y}) \right] \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where N means normal ordering, $\hat{Q}_s$ are the kinetic one particle operators for each componet and ρ_0 a possibly needed jellium background density. The external field $\phi(\vec{x})$ is assumed being generated by an electrostatic charge density through the Poisson equation

$$\phi(\vec{x}) = \int \frac{4\pi}{|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|}\rho(\vec{y})d^3y. \tag{3}$$

Let us consider a translationally invariant ground state of the system $|\Omega_g>$ and the adiabatic connection of a specific density $\rho(\vec{x})$ under the above defined scheme. Then, the ground state to ground state transition amplitude given by $\mathcal{Z}$ in (1) should obey

$$<\Omega_g, in|\Omega_g, out>= \exp\Big(-\frac{i}{\hbar}\Delta E[\phi]T\Big), \tag{4}$$

with $\Delta E[\phi] = E[\phi] - E_g$ and $E[\phi]$ and E_g are the ground state energies in presence and absence of the source ρ respectively. For the generator of connected Green functions W it follows at large L values

$$W[\phi(\vec{x})] = -i\hbar \ln \mathcal{Z}[\phi(\vec{x})] = -(E[\phi] - E_g)T. \tag{5}$$

Next, consider the search for the minimum of the mean value of the energy in the state space under the restriction that the mean value of the internally produced charge density takes a fixed static value $\rho_i(\vec{x})$ that is

$$\frac{<\Omega|\sum_s q_s\psi_s^+(\vec{x})\psi_s(x) - \rho_0|\Omega>}{<\Omega|\Omega>} = \rho_i(\vec{x}). \tag{6}$$

The usual normalization condition $<\Omega|\Omega>= 1$ will be also required.

Alternatively the extremum to be found can be obtained by using the method of Lagrange multipliers and minimizing the quantity

$$<\Omega|H|\Omega> -\alpha <\Omega|\Omega> - \int d^3x\beta(\vec{x}) <\Omega|\sum_{s=1}^{r} q_s\psi_s^+(\vec{x})\psi_s(\vec{x}) - \rho_0|\Omega>, \tag{7}$$

in which α and $\beta(\vec{x})$ are to be determined from imposing the normalization and mean field condition (6). The extremal of these expressions over arbitrary states leads to the following Schodinger equation for the solution $|\Omega>$.

$$\Big(H - \int d^3x\beta(\vec{x})\sum_{s=1}^{r}(q_s\psi_s^+(\vec{x})\psi_s(\vec{x}) - \rho_s)\Big)|\Omega>= \alpha|\Omega> . \tag{8}$$

But, on another hand the state which is obtained after the adiabatic connection of a density $\rho(\vec{x})$ is also abeying the Schrodinger equation

$$(H - \int d^3x\phi(\vec{x})\Big(\sum_{s=1} q_s\psi_s^+(\vec{x})\psi_s(\vec{x}) - \rho_0\Big)|\Omega_\phi >= E[\phi]|\Omega_\phi > \tag{9}$$

Therefore, if the auxiliary charge $\rho(\vec{x})$ is taken sufficiently small in order that no crossing of energy levels occurs in connecting it, the state $|\Omega_\phi >$ is also the ground state in presence of the source $\rho(\vec{x})$. Thus, minimal conditions under the constraints (6) and the normalization condition are obeyed by the state $|\Omega_\phi >$ if the multiplier values are selected to be

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= E[\phi_{\rho_i}] \\ \beta(\vec{x}) &= \phi_{\rho_i}(\vec{x}) \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\phi_{\rho_i}(\vec{x})$ is such a field that forces the internal density

$$< \Omega|\sum_{s=1} q_s\psi_s^+(\vec{x})\psi(\vec{x}) - \rho_0|\Omega >$$

to be equal to $\rho_i(\vec{x})$. Here the central point comes. Taking the scalar product of (9) with $|\Omega\phi_{\rho_i} >$ the minimal values for the mean energy, once the field $\phi(\vec{x})$ is fixed, takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} < H >_{\Omega_\phi} &= < \Omega_\phi|H|\Omega_\phi > \\ &= \Delta E[\phi] + \int d^3x\rho_i(\vec{x})\phi(\vec{x}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{T}(W[\phi] - \int d^3x\rho_i(\vec{x})\phi(\vec{x})) + E_g \\ &= E_g - \frac{1}{T}\Gamma[\rho_i], \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\phi(\vec{x}) = \phi_{\rho_i}(\vec{x})$ and the effective action $\Gamma[\rho_i]$ as a functional of any space time dependent field $\rho_i(x), x = (\vec{x}, t)$ is given by the Legendre transformation from the variables $\phi(x)$ to the mean fields $\rho_i(x)$

$$\Gamma[\rho_i] = W[\phi(\vec{x}, t)] - \int dx\rho_i(\vec{x}, t)\phi(\vec{x}, t) \tag{12}$$

$$\rho_i(x) = \frac{\delta W}{\delta\phi(x)},$$

$$\int dz \frac{\delta\Gamma[\rho_i]}{\delta\rho_i(x)\delta\rho_i(z)}|_{\rho_i=0} \frac{\delta W[\phi]}{\delta\phi(z)\delta\phi(y)}|_{\phi=0} = -\delta^{(4)}(x-y)$$

.

But, $< H >_{\Omega_\phi}$ in (11) is the minimum value of the mean energy under a restriction, therefore it should be necessarely greater than the ground state energy which is the fully unrestricted extremal value. Thus, the stability condition for the assumed translational invariant ground state becomes

$$< H >_{\Omega\phi} - E_g = -\frac{1}{T}\Gamma[\rho_i(\vec{x})] \geq 0, \tag{13}$$

which requires the positivity of the effective potential under variation of the internal density $\rho_i(\vec{x})$

$$V[\rho_i(\vec{x})] = -\lim_{T\to\infty}\left[\frac{1}{T}\Gamma[\rho_i(x)]\right]. \tag{14}$$

Thus, the functional formed by the second derivatives of V should be a positive definite kernel. This is the stability condition obtained by Kirshnitz [3] and it should be certainly obeyed. As it was discussed in [4] condition (14) also allows for negative values of the dielectric function. It will be seen in what follows. Integrating the last of relation (12) at vanishing $\phi = \rho_i = 0$ over both time t_x and t_y, dividing by the integration interval T and making use of the assumed translation invariance, it follows for the second derivative of $V[\rho_i]$

$$\int d^3z \Big(\int dt \Gamma^{(2)}(\vec{x}-\vec{z},t)\Big) \int dt' W^{(2)}(\vec{z}-\vec{y},t') = -\delta^{(3)}(\vec{x}-\vec{y}),$$

$$\int d^3z \frac{\delta^2 V[\rho_i]}{\delta\rho_i(\vec{x})\rho_i(\vec{z})}|_{\rho_i=0} W^{(2)}(\vec{z}-\vec{y}, w=0) = \delta^{(3)}(\vec{x}-\vec{y}), \tag{15}$$

in which

$$\Gamma^{(2)}(x-y) = \frac{\delta^2 W}{\delta\rho_i(x)\delta\rho_i(y)}|_{\rho_i=0}, \tag{16}$$

$$W^{(2)}(x-y)=\frac{\delta^2 W}{\delta\phi(x)\delta\phi(y)}|_{\phi=0}, \tag{17}$$

and $W^{(2)}(\vec{x},\omega)$ is the temporal Fourier transform of $W^{(2)}(x)$.

y That is, the second derivative kernel of the effective potential is the inverse of the temporal Fourier transformation of $W^{(2)}$. The Fourier transform can be evaluated as usual by introducing the completion formula of the state space between the two operators in the relevant time ordering. It produces

$$\begin{aligned}W^{(2)}(\vec{x}-\vec{y},0) &= \frac{1}{\hbar}\sum_{n\neq 0} 2Re[<0|\sum_{s=1}^{r} q_s\psi_s^{+}(\vec{x})\psi_s(\vec{x})|n>. \\ &\quad \frac{1}{(\epsilon_n-\epsilon_0)}<n|\sum_{s=1} q_s\psi_s^{+}(\vec{y})\psi_s(\vec{y})|0>], \end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

where $|0>=|\Omega_\phi>$ and $\epsilon_0=E_g$.

For the space Fourier transform of (18) ot follows

$$W^{(2)}(\vec{k},0)=\frac{1}{\hbar V}\sum_{n\neq 0}\frac{2|<0|\hat{\rho}(\vec{k})|n>|^2}{\epsilon_n-E_g} \tag{19}$$

with $\hat{\rho}_i(\vec{k})$ equal to the total density operator $\sum_s q_s\psi_s^{+}(\vec{x})\psi_s(\vec{x})$. This expression for $W^{(2)}$ shows that the kernel $W^{(2)}(\vec{x}-\vec{y})$ is positive definite whenever E_g is really the ground state energy, that is $E_g\leq\epsilon_n$. Then, the kernel formed the by the second derivatives of the effective potential should be also positive definite

$$\int d^3x d^3y \rho_i(\vec{x})\frac{\delta V[\rho_i]}{\delta\rho_i(\vec{x})\delta\rho_i(\vec{y})}\Big|_{\rho_i=0}\rho_i(\vec{y})\geq 0, \tag{20}$$

for an arbitrary density $\rho_i(\vec{x})$.

Let us consider now further independent restrictions required by the stability of certain systems. For this purpose it will be made explicit below how the source $\rho_i(\vec{x})$ can be considered as a fluctuation of the jellium charge density ρ_0. Note that the fixing of a definite jellium density is an external constraint on the system. In most of the real systems the charge density of the homogeneous jellium is fixed self consistenty by the interaction with the charged particles.

Consider the interaction of the system with a modified jellium in the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
I = \frac{1}{2}\int d^3x d^3y ((\sum_{s=1}^{r} q_s \psi_s^+(\vec{x})\psi_s(\vec{x}) - \rho_0 - \rho(\vec{x})).\\
\upsilon_\epsilon(\vec{x}-\vec{y})(\sum_{s=1}^{r} q_s \psi_s^+(\vec{y})\psi_s(\vec{y}) - \rho_0 - \rho(\vec{y})), \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the ordering of the density operators is not relevant if the Coulomb interaction is regularized through a parameter ϵ in such a way that it vanish at $\vec{x}-\vec{y}=0$. Also it can be assumed that υ_ϵ remain being positive function $\upsilon_\epsilon(\vec{x}-\vec{y}) \geq 0$.

Relation (21) can be also written in the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
I &= \int d^3x d^3y \sum_{s=1}^{r} q_s \psi_s^+(\vec{x})\psi_s(\vec{x})\upsilon_\epsilon(\vec{x}-\vec{y}) \sum_{s=1} q_s \psi_s^+(\vec{y})\psi_s(\vec{y}) \\
&- \sum_{s=1}^{r} q_s \psi_s^+(\vec{x})\psi_s(\vec{x})\upsilon_\epsilon(\vec{x}-\vec{y})(\rho_0+\rho(\vec{y})) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}(\rho_0+\rho)(\vec{x})\upsilon_\epsilon(\vec{x}-\vec{y})(\rho+\rho(\vec{x})). \qquad (22)
\end{aligned}
$$

But due to the constancy of ρ_0 it follows that on any state with fixed number of particles and in a thermodynamical limit sense

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int d^3x d^3y \sum_{s=1}^{r} \rho_s \psi_s^+(\vec{x})\psi_s(\vec{x})\frac{1}{|x-y|}\rho_0|\Omega> = \int d^3\vec{x} \quad \hat{Q}\frac{1}{|\vec{x}|}\rho_0|\Omega> \\
= \int d^3x d^3y \rho_0 \frac{1}{|x-y|}\rho_0|\Omega>, \qquad (23)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\hat{Q}$ is the total charge operator.

By also considering that the total jellium charge does not vary in the fluctuation, that is

$$\int d^3x \rho(\vec{x}) = 0$$

, it follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
I &= \int d^3x d^3y \Big(\sum_{s=1}^{r} q_s \psi_s^+(\vec{x}) \psi(\vec{x}) \frac{v_\epsilon(\vec{x}-\vec{y})}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{r} q_s \psi_s^+(\vec{y}) \psi_s(\vec{y}) \qquad (24) \\
&- \Big(\sum_{s=1}^{r} q_s \psi_s^+(\vec{x}) \psi_s(\vec{x}) - \rho_0 \Big) \phi(\vec{x}) + \frac{1}{4\pi} \partial\phi(\vec{x}) \partial\phi(\vec{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \rho_0 \frac{1}{|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|} \rho_0 \Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, the Coulomb interaction operator of the system in (2) coincides with I apart from the necessary divergent self energy of the jellium plus the electrostatic self energy of the fluctuation. Clearly, the absence of the last term in (24) means that it is added in the energy $E[\phi]$ in (9).

Finally let us consider the work done by the external systems in order to impose a constraint consisting in the variation ρ in the jellium density (or its equivalent: a fixation of evalue $\rho_i(\vec{x})$ of the internal density).

Note that the work Σ that should be performed to create, let say the mean value of the internal density $\rho_i(\vec{x})$ should be equal to the energy of the state after connecting $\phi_{\rho_i}(\vec{x})$ plus the energy of the electrostatic field $\phi_{\rho_i}(\vec{x})$ minus the ground state energy E_g. That is

$$
\Sigma[\phi_{\rho_i}] = E[\phi_{\rho_i}] + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^3x \partial\phi_{\rho_i}(\vec{x}) \partial\phi_{\rho_i}(\vec{x}) - E_g. \qquad (25)
$$

Note, that this quantity differes radically from the effective potential (14). From (5) it follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
E^{(2)}[\phi_{\rho_i}] &= \frac{\delta E(\phi)}{\delta\phi_{\rho_i}(\vec{x}) \delta\phi_{\rho_i}(\vec{y})} \\
&= W^{(2)}(\vec{x}-\vec{y}, \omega = 0) \\
= -\frac{1}{\hbar} \sum_{n \neq 0} 2 & \quad \frac{Re[<0| \sum_s q_s \psi^+(\vec{x}) \psi(\vec{x}) |n><n| \sum_t q_t \psi_t^+(\vec{y}) \psi_t(\vec{y}) |0>]}{\epsilon_n - \epsilon_0}.
\end{aligned}
\qquad (26)
$$

Hence, the second derivatives of Σ are given by

$$\frac{\delta\Sigma[\phi_{\rho_i}]}{\delta\phi_{\rho_i}(\vec{x})\delta\phi(\vec{y})} = -\frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla^2\delta(\vec{x}-\vec{y}) - \frac{1}{\hbar}\sum_{n\neq 0} 2Re[< 0|\sum_s q_s\psi_s^+(\vec{x})\psi_s(\vec{x})|n > \frac{1}{\epsilon_n-\epsilon_0} < n|\sum_t q_t\psi_t^+(\vec{y})\psi_t(\vec{y})|0 >]. \quad (27)$$

Further, its spatial Fourier transform takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma^{(2)}(\vec{k}) &= \frac{k^2}{4\pi}\Big(1-\frac{\upsilon(\vec{k})}{\hbar}\cdot\frac{2}{V}\sum_{n\neq 0}\frac{|< 0|\hat{\rho}_{\vec{k}}|n >|^2}{\epsilon_n-\epsilon_0}\Big)\\ &= \frac{\epsilon k^2}{4\pi}\cdot\frac{1}{\epsilon(\vec{k})}, \qquad (28)\end{aligned}$$

in which as, usual for the dielectric ϵ, reponse R and polarization P functions the following relations take place [7]

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\epsilon(\vec{k})} &= 1+\upsilon(\vec{k})R(\vec{k}) = \frac{1}{1-\upsilon(\vec{k})P(\vec{k})},\\ P(\vec{k}) &= \frac{R(\vec{k})}{1+\upsilon(k)R(k)},\\ R(\vec{k}) &= \frac{P(\vec{k})}{1-\upsilon(\vec{k})P(\vec{k})} \qquad (29)\\ &= \frac{2}{\hbar V}\cdot\sum_{n\neq 0}\frac{|< 0|\hat{\rho}_k|n >|^2}{\epsilon_0-\epsilon_n}.\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the stability condition following from the positivity of the effective action is given by [3]

$$-R(\vec{k}) = \frac{1}{\upsilon(\vec{k})}\frac{1}{\epsilon(\vec{k})}(\epsilon(\vec{k})-1) \geq 0 \qquad (30)$$

which implies the inequalities

$$\epsilon(\vec{k}) > 1 \qquad \text{or} \qquad \epsilon(\vec{k}) < 0. \qquad (31)$$

Then, we arrived to the main point; the requirement that a positive work is always needed to produce a definite value of the internal charge density $\rho_i(\vec{k})$ leads to the positivity of of the dielectric function $\epsilon(\vec{k})$ or its inverse. However, this condition should not be directly interpletable as a stability one. In order to be so, the jellium should be a freely moving system which homogeneity is self consistently determined by its strong Coulomb interaction with the particle components. Although, such should be the case in many systems, it is not the general one. For example, if the charges of the components completely cancels, then ρ might describe only an external auxiliary charge. Then, the work to stablish it is not excluded that could be negative. However, if the jellium is a freely moving and non-vanishing, it becames clear that the full system,that is particles + jellium, can diminish dinamically its energy by adopting an inhomogeneous configuration whenever $\epsilon(\vec{k})$ can be negative.

The existence of further intrinsic physical conditions requiring the positivity rule $\epsilon(\vec{k}) > 0$ will be considered in the next section where the electromagnetic field is considered as a dynamical one.

3 $\epsilon(\vec{k})$ and dynamical photon fields

In this section, an additional support for the necessary positivity of the static dielectric function is given. As it can be reminded, in last section such a condition only followed after assuming that the jellium compensating charges were dynamical ones. Then, the stability of the whole system required $\epsilon(\vec{k}) \geq 0$. However, as it will be discussed below , it seems that the internal stability of the charged system also requires that rule, no matter the character of the jellium dynamics. The argument follows from a treatment in which the electromagnetic field is considered as quantized. Also the system will be described at zero temperature by the euclidean quantum field theory limit of the Matsubara finite temperature theory [8]-[9]. Let us consider the partition function of a charged system in interaction with the electromagnetic field as given by

$$\mathcal{Z}[j] \;=\; Tr\left[\exp(-\beta H)T\left(\exp\int -\frac{1}{\hbar c}\int dx\; j_\mu(x)\hat{A}_\mu(x)\right)\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{N}\int \mathcal{D}\psi^{+}\mathcal{D}\psi\mathcal{D}A_{\mu}\exp\left[S-\frac{1}{\hbar c}\int d^{4}x\; j_{\mu}(x)A_{\mu}(x)\right] \qquad (33)$$

,

where the euclidean action for the charged system can be considered in the form [9]

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{1}{\hbar c}\int_{0}^{\beta}dx_{4}\int d^{3}x\left(\mathcal{L}_{f}(\psi_{s}^{+},\psi_{s},A_{\mu})-\frac{1}{16\pi}\,F_{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}\right.\\ &\quad\left.-\frac{1}{2\alpha}\,(\partial_{\mu}A_{\mu})^{2}\right),\quad s=1,\dots r, \end{aligned} \qquad (34)$$

in which $F_{\mu\nu}=\partial_{\mu}A_{\nu}-\partial_{\nu}A_{\mu}$, ψ_{s}^{+}, ψ_{s} are the fermion fields describing the $s=1,....r$ species of charged particles and A_{μ} is the electromagnetic field. The operator H is the system hamiltonian in the extended state space including the non-physical photons as well as the auxiliary ghost particles. The coordinate x_4 is a real one and takes values in the interval $(0,\beta)$ with $\beta=\hbar c/kT$. The α-dependent term in (34) is associated to the Fadeev-Popov quantization of the gauge electromagnetic field. In the case of the electromagnetic field, the contribution to the partition function (33) of the auxiliary ghost particles compensating the scalar and longitudinal unphysical degrees of freedom, becomes a field independent determinant. Here it is assumed to be included in the normalization constant N in (33). For concreteness, the fermion part of the lagrangian can be taken to be the summ of r terms, each one corresponding to the interaction of non-relativistic particles with the quantized electromagnetic field, that is [10]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{f} &= \sum_{s=1}^{r}\left(-\hbar c\psi_{s}^{+}\,\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{4}}\,\psi_{s}-\frac{1}{2m_{s}}\psi_{s}^{+}\left(\vec{p}-\frac{e}{c}\,\vec{A}(x)\right)^{2}\psi_{s}\right)\\ &\quad-(\sum_{s=1}^{r}q_{s}\psi_{s}^{+}(x)\psi_{s}(x)-\rho_{0})A_{4}(x). \end{aligned} \qquad (35)$$

Expression (35) for $\mathcal{L}_f$ should be very accurate for the description of typical condensed matter physical systems in which the dynamics of the charged particles can be considered as non-relativistic.

The mean electromagnetic fields can be obtained through the logarithmic derivative of $\mathcal{Z}$ with respect to j as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\hat{A}_{\mu}(x)\rangle &= -\hbar c\,\frac{\delta\ell n\;Z[j]}{\delta\;j_{\mu}(x)}=\frac{\delta\;W[j]}{\delta\;j_{\mu}(x)}\\ &= \frac{\int\mathcal{D}\psi^{+}\mathcal{D}\psi\mathcal{D}A_{\mu}\;A_{\mu}(x)\exp[S-\int dx\;j_{\mu}A_{\mu}]}{\int\mathcal{D}\psi^{+}\mathcal{D}\psi\mathcal{D}A_{\mu}\exp[S-\int dx\;j_{\mu}A_{\mu}]}, \end{aligned} \qquad (36)$$

in which the generating functional of the connected Green functions $W[j]$ is defined by

$$W[j]=-\hbar c\;\ell n\;Z[j] \qquad (37)$$

Up to now, the finite temperature situation is yet being considered. Further, the $T = 0$ limit will be assumed.

It can be remarked that the variety of subtle points associated with the thermodynamical $T \neq 0$ situation need for a more involved discussion in order to properly interpret the numerical or experimental data and the existing viewpoints [4]-[5]. These question will be considered elsewhere.

Now, it is possible to perform a Legendre transformation to consider the mean fields as the new independent variables in place of the sources j, through

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma[A_\mu] &= W[j] - \int dx\ j_\mu(x) A_\mu(x), \qquad (38) \\ A_\mu(x) &= \frac{\delta\ W[j]}{\delta j_\mu(x)}. \qquad (39) \end{aligned}$$

Taking the derivative of (38) over A it follows

$$\frac{\delta \Gamma[A_\mu]}{\delta\ A_\mu(x)} = -j_\mu(x) \qquad (40)$$

which after derivating over $j_\nu(y)$ and taking $j_\mu = A_\mu = 0$ leads to

$$\int dz\ \left.\frac{\delta \Gamma[A]}{\delta\ A_\mu(x) \delta A_\alpha(z)}\right|_{A=0} \left.\frac{\delta^2 W[j]}{\delta j_\alpha(z) \delta j_\nu(y)}\right|_{j=0} = -\delta_{\mu\nu}\ \delta^{(4)}(x-y). \qquad (41)$$

Up to now the sources and field A_μ have been considered as x_4 dependent in eucliden space. Then, let us consider the static limit associated to equilibrium configurations. In that case

$$\begin{aligned} j_\mu &= (0,0,0,\rho(\vec{x})), \\ A_\mu &= (0,0,0,\phi(\vec{x})), \end{aligned} \qquad (42)$$

where it is assumed that when the external source is purely electrostatic, the system is able only to generate electrostatic mean fields. This is the case, in particular if parity invariance is not broken for example in the absence of external magnetic fields or other parity breaking effects.

The effective potential is then given by the limit

$$V[\varphi(\vec{x})] = \lim_{L \to \infty} \left[\frac{1}{L}\ \Gamma[0,0,0,\phi_L(\vec{x}, x_1)]\right], \qquad (43)$$

in which ϕ_L is taken as coinciding with $\phi(\vec{x})$ in $(0, L)$ and diminishing to zero outside.

Now let us consider as in the previous section the variational problem of finding the extremum of the mean energy within the subspace of physical states under a restriction for a fixed mean field $A_\mu = (0,0,0,\phi(\vec{x}))$. Due to the extremality condition a Schrodinger equation should follow for the ground state in presence of a source $j_\mu = (0,0,0,\rho(\vec{x}))$ in the form

$$\left(H+\int d^3x\ j_\mu(\vec{x})\ \hat{A}_\mu(\vec{x})\right)\ |\Omega_j\rangle = E[j]|\Omega_j\rangle, \tag{44}$$

where as before H is the system Hamiltonian in the extended space.

Taking the scalar product with $|\Omega_j>$

$$\langle\Omega_j|H|\Omega_j\rangle - E_g = \left(E[j]-E_g-\int d^3x\ \rho(\vec{x})\varphi(\vec{x})\right). \tag{45}$$

But in the euclidean limit of the Matsubara theory at great values of L it should follow

$$\begin{aligned} -\hbar c\ \ell n\ \mathcal{Z}[j] &\cong -\hbar c\ \ell n\left[\exp\left(-\frac{L}{\hbar c}\ E[j]\right)\right] \\ W[0,0,0,\rho(\vec{x})] &\cong L\ E[j]. \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Then, in a similar way as in the previous section, and because $|\Omega_j>$ is a conditional extremal within the physical states subspace, the following inequality should be valid

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\Omega_j|H|\Omega_j\rangle - E_g &= \lim_{L\to\infty}\left[\frac{1}{L}\left(W[0,0,0,\rho(\vec{x})-\int dx\ \rho(\vec{x})\varphi_L(\vec{x},x_4)\right)\right]-E_g \\ &= \lim_{L\to\infty}\left(\frac{1}{L}\ \Gamma[0,0,0,\varphi_L(\vec{x},x_4)]\right)-E_g \\ &= V[\varphi(\vec{x})]-E_g\geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Let us find now an expression for the kernel of the second derivatives of V which due to (47) should be a positive definite one. The Fourier transform of the equation (41) can be written as [8]

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{k^2}{4\pi}\ \delta_{\mu\alpha}\right. &- \left.\left(\frac{1}{4\pi}+\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\ k_\mu k_\alpha-\Pi_{\mu\alpha})k)\right)\ \mathcal{D}_{\alpha\nu}(k) = -\delta_{\mu\nu}, \\ k &= (\vec{k},k_4), \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where $\Pi_{\mu\nu}$ is the polarization tensor which due to gauge invariance satisfies the tranversality condition

$$k_\mu\ \Pi_{\mu\nu}(k)=0 \tag{49}$$

These relations allow to evaluate the Fourier tranform of the kernel $\frac{\delta^2V[\phi]}{\delta\phi(\vec{x})\delta\phi(\vec{y})}$. Note that the increment of a functional under a x_4 independent increment in the argument is given by

$$\delta F[\phi]=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}dx_4\ \frac{\delta\ F[\phi]}{\delta\phi(\vec{x},x_4)}\ \delta\phi(\vec{x}). \tag{50}$$

Thus, after using translation invariance

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left.\frac{\delta^2 V[\phi]}{\delta\phi(\vec{x})\delta\phi(\vec{y})}\right|_{\phi=0} &= \frac{1}{L}\int dx_4\ dy_4\ \left.\frac{\delta^2\Gamma[0,0,0,\phi]}{\delta\phi(\vec{x},x_4)\ \delta\phi(\vec{y},y_4)}\right|_{\phi=0} \\
&= \int dx_4\ \left.\frac{\delta^2\Gamma[0,0,0,\phi]}{\delta\phi(\vec{x}-\vec{y},x_4)\ \delta\phi(\vec{0},0)}\right|_{\phi=0} \\
&= \Gamma^{(2)}(\vec{x}-\vec{y},0), \qquad (51)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\Gamma^{(2)}(\vec{x}-\vec{y},k_4)$ is the temporal Fourier transform of the kernel

$$
\Gamma^{(2)}(x-y) = \left.\frac{\delta\Gamma[0,0,0,\phi]}{\delta\phi(x)\ \delta\phi(y)}\right|_{\phi=0}. \qquad (52)
$$

But, integrating relation (41) over y_4 and taking the $\mu=\nu=4$ component leads to

$$
\int d^3z\ \Gamma^{(2)}_{4\alpha}(\vec{x}-\vec{z},0)\ \mathcal{D}_{\alpha 4}(\vec{z}-\vec{y},0) = -\delta^{(3)}(\vec{x}-\vec{y}), \qquad (53)
$$

where as before $\mathcal{D}_{\mu\nu}$ is the temporal Fourier transform of

$$
\left.\frac{\delta^2 W}{\delta j_\mu(x)\ \delta j_\nu(y)}\right|_{j=0}. \qquad (54)
$$

In momentum space it follows

$$
\Gamma^{(2)}_{4\alpha}(\vec{k},0)\ \mathcal{D}_{\alpha 4}(\vec{k},0) = -1. \qquad (55)
$$

However, from the Dyson equation (48) in the static limit $k_4=0$ and $\mu=\nu=4$ also follows

$$
\left(\frac{\vec{k}^2}{4\pi}\ \delta_{4\alpha} - \Pi_{4\alpha}(\vec{k},0)\right)\ \mathcal{D}_{\alpha 4}(\vec{k},0) = -1. \qquad (56)
$$

This relation can be further simplified by noticing that by transversality and the assumed parity invariance $\Pi_{\mu\nu}$ should have the structure [8]

$$
\Pi_{\mu\nu}(k) = \pi_t(k)\left(\delta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{k^2} - \ell_\mu\ell_\nu\right) + \pi_{44}(k)\ \ell_\mu\ell_\nu. \qquad (57)
$$

with

$$
\ell_\mu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k^2}}\ \left(-\frac{\vec{k}}{|\vec{k}|}\ k_4, |\vec{k}|\right), \quad k^2 = \vec{k}^2 + k_4^2. \qquad (58)
$$

Thus, in the static limit $k_4 = 0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{4i} &= \pi_t(k)\left(\delta_{4i} - \frac{k_4 k_i}{k^2} - \ell_4\ell_i\right) + \pi_{44}(k)\ell_4\ell_i \\
&= 0, \qquad I = 1,2,3. \qquad (59)
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, relation (56) reduces to

$$\left(\frac{\vec{k}^2}{4\pi} - \Pi_{44}(\vec{k},0)\right)\ \mathcal{D}_{44}(\vec{k},0) = -1,$$

which gives $\vec{k}^2/4\pi - \Pi_{44}(\vec{k},0)$ as the Fourier transform of the stability kernel $\Gamma^{(2)}(\vec{v}-\vec{y},0)$. Henceforth, the stability condition takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int d^3x d^3y\, \phi(x)\ \left.\frac{\delta^2 V[\phi]}{\delta\phi(\vec{x})\delta\phi(\vec{y})}\right|_{\phi=0}\ \phi(\vec{y}) \\
&= \int d^3k\, \phi(\vec{k})\ \left(\frac{\vec{k}^2}{4\pi} - \Pi_{44}(\vec{k},0)\right)\ \phi(k) \\
&= \int d^3k\ \phi^*(k)\ \frac{\vec{k}^2}{4\pi}\ \left(1 - v(\vec{k})P(\vec{k})\right)\phi(k) \\
&= \int d^3k\ \phi^*(k)\ \frac{\vec{k}^2}{4\pi} \in (\vec{k})\phi(\vec{k}) \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

for arbitrary fields $\phi(\vec{k})$ and where $\epsilon(\vec{k})$ and $P(\vec{k})$ are the dielectric and polarization functions and $v(\vec{k}) = 4\pi/|\vec{k}|^2$. Relation (60) is the mentioned property. That is, the positivity of the dielectric function as an additional stability condition complementing the ones given in [3] and [4].

4 Summary

It has been argued that the postivity of the dielectric function should be a necessary condition for the stability of a translational and parity invariant ground state of a charged many particle system at zero temperature. The connection of this condition with the alternative ones in [3] and [4] was analyzed.

In complementing the here presented viewpoint it could be of interest to comment on the Wigner crystallization problem. It was the main example given in [3] and [4] for supporting the possibility for negative values of the dielectric function at zero temperature in a homogeneous state. The present discussion suggests that in lowering the charge density at $T = 0$ the homogeneity is broken at a point of infinite screening $\epsilon - > \infty$ which is the unset for the appearing of negative values of $\epsilon(\vec{k})$. Then, if the positivity condition is correct, the translation invariance of the ground state is lost and the system pass to an inhomogeneous state (local order, plasma wave, ...). In such phases the notion of a dielectric constant with only one wavevector argument $\vec{k}$ lost the meaning. Then, in further diminishing the density, the system could attain the Wigner crystallization phase. Therefore, it seems that requiring as in [4], that after lowering the density, the Wigner crystal can only appear as related with a solution of a dispersion equation $\epsilon(\vec{k}) = 0$ for a homogeneous state (only one $\vec{k}$ argument of the dielectric function) is not necessarely valid. But, this condition is the main argument given in [4] in order to associate the Wigner crystallization problem as a physical system showing negative values of $\epsilon(\vec{k})$ at zero temperature.

Finally, the situation at finite temperature should be also commented. The present discussion and the previous work [5] indicate that a similar analysis could be valid at $T \neq 0$. This problem will be considered elsewhere. In particular in Ref.[12], evaluations of the dielectric function at $T \neq 0$ for various classical plasma systems have been presented. The results show negative values at inverse wavelength regions of the order of the interparticle distances. At such wavelengths the notion of a mean field as a statistically well defined thermodynamical internal parameter seems to loss sense. Then, under the assumption that a similar condition $\epsilon(\vec{k}) \geq 0$ could be found, as implied by a minimal value of a thermodynamical potential, the negative values of the dielectric constant obtained in classical plasma systems could be associated with anomalous non-gaussian probabilities for fluctuations around the homogeneous field configuration [11]. It seems to me that such a situation could be interpreted perhaps, as a sort of weak breaking of the translational invariance possibly associated to some kind of measurable spatial inhomogeneities. It should be noticed that the thermal energies related with the mentioned results are substantially lower than the coulomb energy at the mean interparticle distances. This observation leads to the interest in investigating the local spatial order in molecular dynamic calculations for such systems (the Monte Carlo configurations, not following the equation of motion, may introduce an artificial homogeneization in the results). A further investigation of this more involved $T \neq 0$ case will be considered elesewhere.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the helpful remarks and comments of Profs. N.H. March and G. Mussardo. In addition I should express my gratitude to the Associate Programme of the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics and CONACyT of Mexico for the support in the realization of this work.

References

1.- M.L. Cohen and P.W. Anderson (1972). "Comments in the Maximum Superconducting Transition Temperature", in Superconductivity in d- and f- Band Metals, edited by D.H. Douglass (AIP, New York) p. 17.

2.- P.C. Martin, Phys. Rev. 161, (1967) 143.

3.- D.A. Kirshnitz, Sov. Phys. Usp. 19 (1976) 530.

4.- O.V. Dolgov, D.A. Kirshnitz and F.G. Maksimov, Rev. Mod. Phys. 53 (1981) 81.

5.- A. Cabo and A. Pérez-Martínez, Phys. Lett. A 222 (1996) 263.

6.- S. Weinberg, "The Quantum Theory of Fields", Vol. II; (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996) p. 72.

7.- D. Pines, "The Many Body Problem", (W.A. Benjamin, Inc., 1973).

8.- E. S. Fradkin, "Quantum Field Theory and Hydrodynamics", Ed. by D.V. Skobel'tsyn, Proceedings of the P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Vol. 29 (Consultant Bureau, 1967).

9.- C. W. Bernard, Phys. Rev. D9 (1974)3312.

10.- W.P. Healey, 'Non-Relativistic Quantum Electrodynamics", (Academic Press, 1982).

11.- L.D. Landau and E.M. Liftshitz, 'Statistical Physics", Part I (Pergamon Press, 1980).

12.- A. Fasolino, A. M. Parrinelo and M. Tosi, Phys. Lett. A66 (1978)119.